

A6362

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — APPENDIX

July 15

ruption and degradation of great goals and ideals, which have come to tar-brush organized labor.

Witness after witness refuses to talk. Maybe, as Senator McCLELLAN has pointed out, their clamming-up, the failure to get the facts out onto the public record has greatly hampered his committee's investigation. But, just the same, the towering mountain of "I won't talk" stands as monumental testimony to the need for immediate clean-up legislation.

Take a look at just one of the many who have paraded in sullen silence across the committee's witness stand.

Abraham Teitelbaum is an attorney. When he took the oath that admitted him to the practice of law, he assumed moral—if not legal—responsibility to stand up against flagrant violation of the law, even if he himself were involved.

Mr. Teitelbaum is a one-time legal counsel for the man who became the symbol of gangland, Scarface Al Capone.

Mr. Teitelbaum was before the McClellan Committee this week.

He clammed up, pleading the fifth amendment 80 times and quoting 3 other amendments on other occasions as grounds for his refusal to answer questions.

Other witnesses, testified of the lawyer's connection with underworld characters who controlled locally in Chicago's Hotel and Restaurant Employees and Bartenders International Union. Payoffs to union leaders reportedly took place in his presence and he was even slated for death by gangsters who wanted to move in and take over.

Mr. Teitelbaum's past record is one of underworld associations. He twice has been indicted for income-tax evasion and has faced disbarment proceedings the same number of times.

Meanwhile, back at the House of Representatives, two Senate labor bills designed to correct some of the conditions earlier McClellan committee hearings uncovered remain buried.

The whole purpose of congressional investigations is to enable Congress to pass more effective legislation. It is a mockery of the effort expended in the Senate hearings to keep such legislation bottled up.

These two Senate bills may not be the best labor legislation that could have been drafted to correct the labor-management abuses uncovered by the committee. But they do provide a reasonable step in the right direction.

The House leadership must not forget these bills in the rush to adjourn by mid-August. If no labor legislation comes out of this session of Congress, the blame will be clear.

It will rest with the House Members, who refuse to consider needed legislation in an election year because it might offend some politically powerful labor bosses.

Caught Short by Iraq Coup, Ike Faces Grave Decisions

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROSS BASS

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 15, 1958

Mr. BASS of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I would like to include the following very excellent and most timely editorial which appeared in the Nashville Tennessean on July 15:

CAUGHT SHORT BY IRAQ COUP, IKE FACES GRAVE DECISIONS

While the Eisenhower administration sat twiddling its thumbs as though in blissful ignorance of the danger, the friendly Government of Iraq in the Middle East has been overthrown by nationalist army leaders, raising the grave question of whether peace can be preserved in that sensitive area.

The Baghdad pact, which was one of Mr. Dulles' inventions, has been blasted to bits, and the Eisenhower doctrine as interpreted by the administration has been given no consideration at all.

The time is now at hand for President Eisenhower and his advisers to make big decisions, and it is heartening that the leader's first act is to call for help from congressional leaders on a bipartisan basis. As far as the Democrats are concerned, they have a duty to help meet a crisis which has been developing since the virtually worthless pact on the sidelines, and they can be expected to meet it in the finest spirit.

There can be little question that the Iraq situation grew out of Lebanon's unsolved troubles, and it is also true that it constitutes another victory for President Nasser of Egypt who has just been consorting with Marshal Tito in Yugoslavia. And though Associated Press analyst William L. Ryan, writing from Belgrade, is not yet convinced that Nasser pulled the string in this latest Pan-Arabian move, it is unbelievable that it could have been staged without his knowledge.

Already there is talk of sending more American troops and ships into the Mediterranean, implying the use of force for a salvage job in Jordan and Lebanon, both of which will be further endangered by the rising nationalist tide. And that brings up the question of what kind of force, and how far our country is ready to go to prevent all of the Middle East from coming under Nasser's sway.

Furthermore, it centers attention on a vacuum in the Eisenhower administration's defense policies.

For as has just been pointed out by one able analyst, there must be a completely new order of thinking on military policy—and this in the sixth year of Republican rule.

"Our current policy is based on a doctrine of massive retaliation, that we threaten an all-out attack on the Soviet Union in case the Soviet Union engages in aggression anywhere," said Dr. Henry A. Kissinger, director of the special studies project of the Rockefeller Brothers Fund, associate director of Harvard's Center for International Affairs, and author of a report that influenced President Eisenhower's military reorganization plan.

"This means," he went on, "that we base our policy on a threat that will involve destruction of all mankind, and this is too risky business, I think—too expensive."

The President might have to decide, this expert observed, whether Beirut is worth 30,000 American lives, and a negative decision will therefore encourage the piecemeal taking over of the world by Soviet aggression.

Yet the use of force in some way cannot be ruled out, and so Dr. Kissinger proposed a policy of limited war—the use of only so much force as is necessary to defend the safety of the free world—and this is where he finds the Eisenhower administration lacking.

He might have added that some of the internal explosions of today cannot be directly traced to Soviet Russia, or even communism, though they make Moscow exceedingly happy.

Nobody in the United States wants war of any kind, but it cannot be ruled out as a

possibility in view of our commitments under a patchwork of treaties. There may well come a time when definite pledges will have to be redeemed to prevent a series of Munichs, when the Eisenhower administration cannot blunder through all crises.

Never was the administration more in need of help, and never were its boasted policies for peace in the Middle East shown to be less effective. After years of brinkmanship it is brought to a brink which it did not desire, but was unable to prevent.

Continuously, it has been outsmarted and outmaneuvered by President Nasser and the movement he represents. When the time came to undermine the Baghdad Pact, it was done with neatness and dispatch and the Eisenhower doctrine, as originally approved, does not cover the newest coup.

We have waged the peace with little imagination or understanding, and massive retaliation has lost much of its meaning.

Aside from its wealth of oil, which America's people should repudiate as a cause of war, Iraq was a friend who has been torn away. It has joined the procession of Arab nationalism, which is no evil per se.

But where is it headed, and how will it affect hopes for peace and understanding? These are questions which call for the closest study, and when the answers are believed to be known, America and her free friends will need to act wisely, well, and decisively.

It may well be that Dr. Kissinger did not go far enough when he declared that there must be a new order of thinking in military matters, and that the reappraisal must be applied to the realm of diplomacy as well. If that is the situation, as we believe it to be, now is time to face it. The seas are indeed turbulent, and a drifting course invites further danger.

Congressman Clare Hoffman Fights for His Party and His Country

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. TIMOTHY P. SHEEHAN

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 14, 1958

Mr. SHEEHAN. Mr. Speaker, our colleague, Congressman CLARE E. HOFFMAN, of Michigan, is a Member whom we all respect and admire. In spite of his years, there are few of us who are able to keep pace with his activities. In my opinion, no Member can surpass him in his knowledge of parliamentary procedure, nor in his ability of self-expression in the rough and tumble action of floor debate.

Mr. HOFFMAN is actively attendant on the floor and very few Members take as great a part in legislative debate. He continuously fights to uphold the traditional Republican principles which we in the Midwest traditionally support. There have been times when Mr. HOFFMAN, like many of us, has had to depart from administration position, but when this is done in the support of his constituency and as a true representative of his people, certainly much credit is due him. Many times I have heard fellow Republicans state that our party is in need of more defenders of the caliber of Mr. HOFFMAN. It has recently come to my attention that the chairman of the